



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

One needs but to read our daily newspapers to see something of the activities of the militarists to organize public opinion in their favor. Witness this news item under date of November 27:

As a result of the national agitation of the Navy League of the United States, 110 neighborhood and civic clubs in Wisconsin will debate this fall on the question of a larger sea force.

In Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Iowa, and other Middle Western States, Rear Admiral Albert Ross, U. S. N., retired, who built the Great Lakes naval training station near Lake Bluff, and Congressman-elect George Edmund Foss will be among the speakers.

This program was announced yesterday by William Mather Lewis, of Lake Forest, field secretary of the Navy League, with headquarters at 1734 First National Bank building. Chicago members number more than 100.

The time has come when those who stand for a better order of things must throw all conventionality to the wind and start out upon aggressive lines. When an editor indulges in loose talk about preparedness, vital interests, national honor, and the like; when he makes misstatements of facts with reference to international matters, let us not be content to shake our heads and say, "How silly." Write the editor; show him his errors; protest against jingoism. If the pacifists are but half as vigilant as the militarists, the editor will soon change his attitude (assuming, of course, that he attempts honestly to reflect public opinion).

When an aspirant for office asks to be sent to Congress, the Navy League is pretty quick to find out how he stands on the armament question. Somehow the pacifists have considered it undignified to inform themselves similarly. The time has come when peace people must serve notice upon any man who places his trust for peace in huge armaments that he is unfit to hold public office.

The peace-loving people in this country far outweigh the militarists, but they softly blow the flute or the oboe or the clarinet, while the militarist rattles the drum. Let him continue to rattle it if he must, but let us at least exchange our instruments for the trombone or the bass horn.

But in addition to organized, aggressive, co-ordinated activity there must be intelligent understanding of the fundamental principles of civilism and militarism. I would therefore have those who care sufficiently about the future of this world of ours face this fact open-mindedly and without prejudice: Europe wanted peace and she got war. What is to be the mechanism by which men in the future can get what they want?

With this commanding fact in mind, I would have them examine the philosophies of a Bernhardt, a Mahan, and a Roosevelt on the one hand, and of a Norman Angell or a David Starr Jordan or a Novicow on the other. I would have them investigate what is the relation of military power to national advantage. Does a nation's commerce depend upon its armed force? I would have them review the history of wars and see what the arbitrament of the sword has accomplished, and then study the history of pacifism and see what the arbitrament of reason and law has wrought. With this study I would couple an investigation into the activities of the war traders and the armament rings.

As our international problems come up from time to time let each man weigh in his mind, Where does our duty lie, having due regard for the viewpoint of the other fellow? How did it look to other nations when

we sent our fleet around the world during the Roosevelt regime? Is it a coincidence that Brazil's and Argentina's military expansion began immediately after the visit of our fleet? How will it affect our widely heralded profession of desiring to lead the world in peace if we improve this time of international unrest, when all other great nations are exploding their powder and sinking their warships, when they are crippling every industry except that of the manufacture of armaments, when they are running themselves into virtual financial bankruptcy, when they are deluging their respective countries with an avalanche of heartache and misery and poverty—if, I say, we improve this time for hanging the millstone of militarism around our necks, even though it be in the name of defense?

I would also have the student of international affairs look into the work of The Hague and determine whether possibly there is some connection between the fact that the delegates to the Hague Conference were preponderantly military men and international law experts—men to whom a "peace" conference connoted a conference for adopting rules of the ring, so to speak—and the fact that relatively little was done along the lines of examining into the conditions that have produced war and evolving a positive substitute for it, but much in the direction of drawing up regulations concerning dum-dum bullets, explosives, bombardment of unfortified towns, and the like. (Incidentally, does not the unceremoniousness with which dum-dum bullets are used, and bombs dropped from the sky, and asphyxiating gases diffused show how futile it is to expect these rules of the game to be observed when the very laws of humanity have been outraged?)

I am indicating but a few problems at random, each of which merits careful study.

Can the American public rouse itself from its state of lethargy, of tacit acceptance of old standards, without examining into the new?

This is the challenge of pacifism.

The Drama and the Peace Movement.

By Rev. William Weston Patton.

Education is the rallying cry of the age. We in America have borne testimony to our belief in its power by establishing our system of public schools. The "little red school-house" has become a familiar sight in our land. It has also become a common illustration in our vernacular. We believe that the stability and the permanence of our form of government rests upon the education of the man with the ballot.

The era of a New Democracy in our land is already here. The initiative, the referendum, the direct primary, and other new features in our political life are gradually taking the control of our national policies out of the hands of the few and vesting them in the hands of the many. Our nation was founded upon faith in the man in the street. And although thus far his direct control of its policies has not been as great as it might; although from the time of Washington and Jefferson down to the present time the minority have held the reins of power,* today as never before the control of our National

* "The New Democracy," by Walter E. Weyl.

Government is passing into the hands of the common citizen. Thus a New Democracy is upon us.

"A progressively diffused education is necessary to the maintenance of this democracy. The people may control the State and yet not know how to direct that control for the benefit of the State or themselves. So today as never before wide-spread education is essential."

This is particularly true in regard to the subject of the future policy of our Government along the lines of international peace. Thus far the education of the people upon this subject has been altogether too limited. Only those particularly interested in the matter have taken the trouble to inform themselves.

The few outstanding leaders in our land who have been fighting for the recognition of the truths of the advantages of peace are the chiefs of a very small party when compared with the vast population of our nation. We all recognize that there has been no wide-spread, concerted attempt to inform the mass of the people about international peace. And yet the experience of the peace party has amply proved that its propaganda makes the greatest headway where information of its work is the most extensive. Here, then, we must concentrate our efforts if the people, into whose hands the control of the Government is rapidly coming, are to place our nation at the forefront of those nations standing for peace.

How is this education of the people along the lines of peace to be accomplished? One way, of course, is through our public schools. Children should have the ideals of peace taught them. They should be taught that allegiance to the flag means something infinitely larger, nobler, and more fundamental than carrying a rifle or marching in a troop of Boy Scouts behind the band on Memorial Day. The time may come when these children will have to respond to the call to arms for their country's sake. Let us hope it may not; but the time will come inevitably when they must respond to the call of citizenship. Put the emphasis upon this kind of patriotism. The horrors and suffering of war, the shallowness and superficiality of military splendor may well be instilled into their minds, so as to create a hate of it, at the same time that allegiance to the flag in this line is brought out.

But this education only touches the youth of our land. We must go farther. We must educate the parents of these same children. And here is where we find our hardest task.

Some men will take the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*; some men will read the pamphlets of the World Peace Foundation; some men will study the books of Norman Angell and von Bernhardt in order to better post themselves upon the subject. This literature is of great value to people, and believers in the peace movement should do all in their power to make access to it more easy.

The reading of such literature, however, rather marks the second stage in this process of education. The great mass of citizens are either not interested in or are ignorant of the existence of this literature. It is to the education of this class of people that we must especially address ourselves. They need something more exciting; they are tired at the end of the day's work and want to be amused. If they are amused, they at the same time are willing to be instructed. Here lies the key to the situation.

Amuse the people. For one thing utilize the moving-picture show. The peace party might well influence the film companies to put on plays pertaining to peace. Any one who has attended a "movie" will instantly see the field here to be worked; but there is still another way much easier and able to be brought into action at once. Give public readings of modern peace plays.

We all know the power of the drama for either good or bad. The modern stage gives many examples of both. Many men have debated for a long time as to whether they would go on to the stage or into the pulpit. They realized the influence for good in them both. The author has two friends who thus debated, and one chose the pulpit; the other the stage. The drama amuses people. It holds their attention. It instructs them. Use it for the education of people along peace lines; it works.

The author speaks from experience. He has tried this method and packed the house. Being a thorough believer in the possibility of educating his fellow-townsmen to the truths of the peace movement, and also being much interested in the modern stage, he conceived the idea of using the one as a means toward the accomplishment of the other. Result: full houses and many inquiries for more literature, both amusing and serious.

Now, the author does not claim to be an actor nor a public reader. In preparatory school he could not even make the "cast," and in college he lasted through the first trial for dramatics and never received a notice to return. It therefore does not take great skill. It merely takes conviction, and, being a "Sky Pilot," he would add prayer. If any man who sincerely believes in the principles of peace will conscientiously try to give such a reading, or strive to interest another who can give it, he will be amply repaid.

In the town of the author we have been running a series of four such meetings this winter in the interests of international peace. They have come once a month and no admittance was charged. Instead a collection was taken each time to cover expenses and to send to the American Peace Society.

At the first meeting the author read "In the Vanguard," through the courtesy of Katrina Trask and the Macmillan Company. At the second meeting he read "The Unseen Empire," through the courtesy of Atherton Brownell and Harper Brothers. At the third meeting he read "The Terrible Meek," through the courtesy of Charles Rann Kennedy and Harper Brothers. At the fourth meeting a lecturer, secured through the State Peace Society, is to speak upon the Peace Propaganda. Prof. Jay William Hudson has kindly consented to give us in this connection his lecture on "The New Internationalism."

Speakers can always be obtained for such lectures, and the permission of authors and publishers to give readings is easily secured. In this connection the literature mentioned above comes far from exhausting the possibilities. Bernard Shaw's "Arms and the Man," Alfred Noyes' "The Wine Press," and "Rada" lend themselves well to such work.

The reading of drama thus presents new opportunities for educating the people. Its great recommendations are, in the first place, that it reaches a class of people otherwise untouched by the peace literature, and, in the second place, that it can be used by any believer in the cause.

Education, then, is the fundamental principle which the peace party should emphasize in this new era, when the control of our national policies is coming so much more directly into the hands of the man with the ballot. Make people think along these lines and they will vote along them. "He made me think" is the keynote of Atherton Brownell's powerful peace play, "The Unseen Empire." And to make people think should be the keynote of the peace party's work. To do this education is essential.

"Were half the power that fills the world with terror,
Were half the wealth bestowed on camps and courts,
Given to redeem the human mind from error,
There were no need of arsenals or forts."

Some Lessons of the War.*

AN OLD SOLDIER'S CONCLUSIONS AS TO WHAT IT
ALL COMES TO.

By Homer B. Sprague.

To the undersigned, carefully observing and much meditating during some months spent in the war zone, certain propositions seem established and certain conclusions warranted. It is perhaps a duty to suggest them for consideration:

1. The most complete and formidable military and naval armament is not only no guaranty of peace, but is pretty surely a provocative of war. A nation armed to the teeth is easily deluded into thinking itself invincible, and is prompted to take great risks. To sister nations its attitude is a perpetual challenge to a trial of strength. Probably Germany would not have drawn the sword had she not felt strong enough to crush all opposition on land; nor would England, had she not felt sure of her ability to dominate the seas.

2. More extensively, if not more clearly than ever before, war is demonstrated to be murder on a great scale, if by murder is meant the intentional killing of innocent human beings, innocent, because the average soldier, whatever his nationality, honestly believes himself to be in duty bound to defend his country against bloodthirsty enemies.

3. While the guilty escape, the guiltless are slain. Shakespeare appears to have been the first to declare that international war cannot be waged without the slaughter of many such. In his "King Henry V" (act 1, scene 2), the King is urged by the Archbishop of Canterbury to "unwind his bloody flag" and make war on France; but the King's conscience is tender on this very point. He tells the prelate why:

"For God doth know how many now in health
Shall drop their blood in approbation
Of what your reverence shall incite us to.
Therefore take heed how you impawn our person,
How you awake our sleeping sword of war;
We charge you, in the name of God, take heed;
For never two such nations did contend
Without much fall of blood, whose guiltless drops
Are every one a woe, a sore complaint
'Gainst him whose wrong gives edge unto the swords
That make such waste in brief mortality."

"Guiltless drops!" This is the argument, everlasting and unanswerable, against international war. To

say nothing of the multitudinous shames, horrors, and sufferings unspeakable which inevitably follow the initial crime, it cannot be carried on without the deliberate murder of tens, hundreds, thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands, of innocent men.

4. Starting with the justification of this fundamental iniquity, and recognizing the popular estimate that the more numerous the murders the more glorious the achievement, it seems logically to follow that any other wrong which may be necessary to secure or hasten victory is permissible, or even glorious. Success being regarded as the highest duty, no law of God or man must stand in the way. If a civilian defends his home, the punishment must have such "frightfulness" that no one will dare repeat the offense. The conqueror's "heart bleeds" with pity, but "necessity knows no law." The logic is that of Satan at first sight of Adam and Eve, whom he has come to destroy:

"And should I at their harmless innocence
Melt, as I do, yet public reason just—
Honor and empire with revenge enlarged
By conquering this new world—compels me now
To do what else, though damned, I should abhor.
So spake the fiend, and with necessity,
The tyrant's plea, excused his devilish deeds."

The temptation to cruelty is irresistible. Sheridan must make the Shenandoah Valley a howling wilderness. The Filipino non-combatants "must be made to want peace, and want it badly." Said our General Bell: "The American army is the most humane that ever took the field; but war is necessarily cruel. It is kill and burn, and burn and kill, and again kill and burn." Within the last two or three weeks Admiral Fisher has been appointed First Sea Lord of the British Admiralty. He was a representative of Great Britain at the Hague Conference. There he spoke emphatically against the idea that war can be humane. "When you have to wring a chicken's neck," said he, "all you think about is wringing it quickly. You don't give the chicken intervals for refreshment and recuperation. It should be the same with warfare. Talk about 'humanizing war!' You might as well talk of humanizing hell. When a silly ass at The Hague got up and talked about the amenities of warfare, and putting your prisoners' feet in warm water and giving them gruel, my reply, I regret to say, was considered brutally unfit for publication. As if war could be civilized! If I am in command when war breaks out, I shall issue my orders. The essence of war is violence; moderation is imbecility. Hit first, hit hard, hit everywhere!"

5. The only effective preventive of such murder, and of all the consequent accumulations of wrongs and woes, must be a recurrence to first principles, as originally commanded by the Founder of Christianity. He insisted that there should be no striking back—that it is always better to suffer wrong than to do wrong—and that all warfare should be spiritual only. His great apostle forbade retaliation, and emphasized the truth of the universal brotherhood of man. A partial reliance on brute force and violence in matters international, rather than on moral suasion, is the fatal mistake thus far made by every political state, with perhaps a single exception. Penn's treaty with the Indian savages at Philadelphia, in October, 1682, continued unbroken more than half a century. Does it not illustrate and

*From the *Springfield Daily Republican* of November 17.